

Remarks

Claims 1-31 are currently pending and stand rejected based on new art rejections. In response, claims 21-29 have been canceled and claims 1-19 and 30-31 have been amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Art Rejections

Regarding claims 1-19, features of claim 18 are now incorporated into claim 1, and claim 1 is further defined consistent within paragraph [0051] and the drawings. The use of a hook and loop fastener system in the context of packet access, to facilitate replacement, is not taught or suggested by the art of record.

None of the cited references even contemplates using a stand alone packet with a powered cleaning device. Zafiroglu discloses no specific structures for placing a packet in any device, and refers to only unpowered devices. In any event, it does not suggest a ready access replacement capability using a hook/loop connector. While hook/loop connectors are, of course, known in other contexts, using them in a high frequency reciprocation device having reduced surface available for attachment (due to the presence of the packet) is surprising. Had the art contemplated this it would have been thought that the connection would have been insecure.

Adams does not cure the deficiency. There is no peel off hook/loop system disclosed in this reference to make it easy to remove the lower member. If anything, Adams would want to restrict such access to avoid spills of particulate detergent.

Applicants thus believe that amended claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art. This also supports allowance of dependent claims 2-19.

In addition with regard to amended dependent claim 8, the Pierce reference is relied on for teaching a burnisher that operates at 2500 rpm. Pierce does not disclose operation at speeds above 2500 rpm, however. Claim 8 has been amended to recite operation at between 3000 and 10000 rpm. See original claim 35 for support for this limitation.

Claims 30-31 were held anticipated by Gruber, *et al.* Claim 30 (and thus claim 31) have now been amended to clarify the non-circular orbital nature of the reciprocation of the brush. See paragraphs [0064], [0039] and [0055] of the specification and prior claim 29. The term "orbital path", in the context of a reciprocating scrub brush, is thus not met by just circular motion, even if circular

reversing motion. Combining an arc motion with reciprocation is particularly advantageous in this type of device.

The Gruber *et al.* reference discloses a power toothbrush with circular reversing motion. While other parts of the device linearly reciprocate, the brush rotates on a single axis in a circular manner, with reversals. See double arrows 37 and 38. The energy to cause the reversal is quite wasteful. In an event, this is not a non-circular motion such as elliptical motion.

Siman discloses simple circular motion.

While oscillatory devices are known in some other contexts, nothing in them suggests how one would combine the oscillator of those devices with the structure of Gruber *et al.* and its projecting brush.

Hence, claims 30 and 31 are also believed to be allowable.

Conclusion

Accordingly, claims 1-19 and 31-31, as amended, are believed to now be in allowable form. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims are thus respectfully requested.

The above amendments have not increased the total claim count or the number of independent claims. Thus, no fees are believed necessary for consideration of this response. Nevertheless, should any additional fees be needed for full consideration of this amendment, please charge any fees believed necessary in connection with this response to Deposit Account No. 10-0849 .

Respectfully submitted,

David C. Long, *et al.*

By: 

Linda Blair Meier

Reg. No.: 39,769

Attorney For Applicant

S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc.

1525 Howe Street, MS 077

Racine, Wisconsin 53403

(262) 260-2474